

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-13, 15 and 16 currently remain in the application. Claims 2, 6 and 14 have been cancelled. Claim 1 has previously been amended.

In said Final Office Action dated April 1, 2003, claims 1, 3-5, 7-13, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Nakagawa in view of Bennett. In order to convince the Examiner what these references really disclose and what may or may not reasonably be regarded obvious in view of these references, applicant submitted declarations by Mr. Nakagawa and Mr. Bennett who essentially stated in said declarations that the subject invention was not obvious to them at the time their inventions were made and they filed their patent applications. Unfortunately, these declarations could not be prepared sufficiently quickly and were not filed until Amendment "G" After Final Action was filed on June 26, 2003. As a result, the Examiner stated in said Advisory Action dated August 28, 2003 that these declarations would not be considered because they were "not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection."


Indeed, these declarations are directed to both issues already argued during the course of the prosecution process and issues raised newly in said Final Office Action, but it was because these declarations could not be prepared and submitted earlier. It is one of the reasons for filing the instant Request for Continued Examination (RCE) pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.114 that these declarations be considered in connection with all of the issues of rejection, not limited to the issues raised in said Final Office Action.

The Examiner is therefore requested to reconsider the arguments presented by applicant in previously filed Amendment "G" while keeping in mind the contents of said declarations. Applicant understands that the Examiner has already been exposed to Amendment "G" and hence will not repeat herein the arguments already presented in said Amendment "G" but applicant firmly believes that the Examiner would come to a different

conclusion after reading said declarations and rereading the arguments in said Amendment "G" in light of these declarations.

In summary, applicant believes that the application is in condition for allowance and such an action at an early date is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Keiichi Nishimura  
Registration No. 29,093

September 11, 2003  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP  
P.O. Box 778  
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778  
Telephone: (510) 843-6200  
Telefax: (510) 843-6203



VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS:

Claim 1 has been amended as follows:

RECEIVED  
SEP 17 2003  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

1. (Four times amended) A packaging system comprising:

a packaging machine which continuously transports a bag-making film along a path while forming said film into a tubular form, fills said tubularly formed film with articles to be packaged inside a bag having a specified bag length and seals said film to produce a packaged product;

a printer and a print roller disposed along said path for printing specified print data on said film as said film passes continuously between said printer and said print roller and causing said printed specified print data to appear on said film;

a packaging condition memory which stores packaging conditions including said bag length and packaging speed for operating said packaging machine;

a print data memory which stores print data from which said specified print data are specified; and

a correlation data memory which stores correlation data between said print data and said packaging conditions, said correlation data memory storing specified ones of said print data in correlation with specified ones of said packaging conditions.